3-59
5|5|21
375

THE

MATERIALISM

OF THE

MORMONS,

OR

LATTER DAY SAINTS,

EXAMINED AND EXPOSED.

BY T. W. P. TAYLDER.

WOOLWICH,

PRINTED BY E. JONES, JOURNAL OFFICE, THOMAS STREET.

1849.

MORMO-MATERIALISM.

"What is truth?" This is the most important question which an intelligent mind can entertain. It is a question which all the philosophers of the Grecian and Roman schools could not answer. They were sufficiently curious to look into it, but they only saw the shadow; clouds and darkness enveloped it. Their vision was contracted. Indeed, this was the case, in some measure, with the Jewish nation, although they possessed a more brilliant light than the gentiles. The Jews had revealed to them the notion of the *One Great Supreme* in opposition to the polytheism of other nations. The Jewish civil and ecclesiastical polities coming immediately from God gave them the advantage over the constitutions of the heathens. Notwithstanding, as neither the famous schools of the Greeks and Romans, so also, they could not answer this question. It was left for the glorious outbreak of gospel truth to dispel these mists. The veil which previously hid the light was taken away in Christ. We now enjoy the full blaze of truth. The light of truth is now perfect in the power of its expansive glory. The repository of this truth is in that volume whose authenticity and veracity cannot be successfully questioned. With the materials afforded us in that sacred book, we are enabled satisfactorily to answer the question, "What is truth?"

This has been the general custom in all ages of the Christian church, "To the law and to the testimony." On the truth contained in the sacred page, they have placed their fondest hopes, and valued it more than all the gold, jewels, and precious stones in the universe; for in that book

> "Ev'ry line is marked with the seal of high divinity,
> And ev'ry leaf bedewed with drops of love."—POLLOCK.

But now it appears, by some new light suddenly sprung up from the *caves* of the *earth*, that this is all a delusion, and that unless you believe certain things, as expounded by certain teachers, who pretend to a *new revelation*, your salvation is

very questionable. These modern teachers inform us that all our previous definitions of truth are erroneous;—all our estimation of her beauty and value is ridiculous. *They* only can draw aside the veil and expose the lovely and enchanting form of Truth. Hitherto we have been plagued with the evils which issue from Pandora's box, but now Hope appears at last, and it is to relieve all our wants and assuage all our woes.

An "Apostle of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints," has assured us that our notions of the Godhead are altogether erroneous,—that "God is a *material* being," that "the *true* God has a *body*, *parts*, and *passions*, as well as *man*." That a "*spirit* is as much *matter* as *oxygen* or *hydrogen*,"—that "it is *not* an *immaterial being*, which is a contradiction in terms—*immateriality is* only another name for *nothing*." That "God the Father and God the Son *cannot* be *everywhere present*." If these things are so, then indeed must we give up all our former conceits, and divesting ourselves of our antiquated prejudices, mantel ourselves in this new robe of light. Locke speaks of the difficulty there is for a person to change opinions after their being entertained for several years. How hard it would be for him to retract all he had ever advanced and to pronounce it as false. He would be more likely to act, as the man in the storm, to hold his cloak the closer around him. This new doctrine however has come to us with such unequivocal evidences of its truth, that forsooth, he must be blind, yea, culpably blind, who will not instantly dismiss without the least "longing, ling'ring look behind," all his preconceived notions, and yield up his judgment to the mere *ipse dixit* of these teachers sent from God. Do they not come to us "with signs and wonders and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost?" How is it possible that with these testimonials, any can escape condemnation, if they withhold their allegiance from this novel scheme?

The followers of Joseph Smith entertain peculiar opinions on all the leading doctrines of sacred writ. They hold the doctrine of the materiality of all existence in common with the ancient Academics, and like the Stoics they have brought the Divine Nature down to the standard of mere man.* With

* Longinus excuses Homer very handsomely, when he says the poet made his gods like men, that he might make his men appear like gods. This excuse cannot hold with the Mormons.

the modern materialists they scruple not to teach that *spirit* is *matter*, and that "immateriality is another name for nothing." They put forth no small claim to authority. All they publish is with superior credentials. It is written either by those of the apostolic office or under the inspiration of a new revelation. It would be supposed that this would assuredly commend itself to the judgment, and that it would most certainly possess the same marks of veracity as those authenticated and genuine records which have been handed down to us from our forefathers, as the uncorrupted words of inspired truth,—that most certainly it would not in the least oppose or contradict that sacred volume. The force of this presumption is rendered stronger when we think of the claims they put forth to exercise dominion over the faith of others. They support their claims by anathematizing all those who do not acknowledge them. They say "Be guided by me only, and such as concur with me in their opinions; but on the peril of damnation hear no other." If their doctrines are founded in truth, then they are worthy of our assent; but if they are the offspring of error, they deserve the most severe reprobation. In either case, true or false, such claims will only be allowed by a priest-ridden people, who willingly call any Rabbi who chooses to assume the title, and to become the followers of this self-constituted umpire of truth, rather than the followers of Christ.* With the Romanists they hold the doctrine of the efficacy of sacraments. Their being "born or baptized with water" is nothing more or less than the "*ex opere operatum*" of the Roman Catholics.

They also assail the cannon of scripture, and aver that it is not full, and that there shall be no end to revelation. Thus, while the Bramins have their Shaster, the Persees their Zundavastaw, the Bonzes of China the writings of Fo-he, the Siamese those written by Sommonocodom, and the Arabs their Alcoran; the Mormons have the book of Mormon, translated by Joseph Smith, their prophet, and with all the pretension they pronounce in its favour, is just as likely to gain the consent of any enlightened intellect as those mentioned.

Notwithstanding these diversities of doctrine, and which are not in unison with those generally received as true, their pre-

* "A man, if he believes things only because his pastor said so, or the assembly so determine, without knowing other reasons, though his belief be true, yet the very truth he holds becomes his heresy.—MILTON.

tensions should be calmly weighed. A reasonable person will have no sympathy with that individual who unhesitatingly pronounces judgment without considering the evidence. Let the reader hold his prejudice in abeyance, for a short period at least, and let him calmly and dispassionately consider these statements put forth as real and necessary truths, essential to salvation. The author of the tract which it is proposed to examine, says, "*the reader's future well being in all time to come, depends upon his rightly understanding*" the subjects concerning which he writes, and these are "*things of infinite importance, without which he can in no wise be saved.*"*

Beattie, in his "Essay on Truth", observes, "The love of truth has ever been accounted a good principle. To have no concern for the truth, to be false and fallacious, is a character which no person who is not utterly abandoned would choose to bear; it is a character from which we expect nothing but levity and inconsistence. Truth seems to be considered by all mankind as something fixed, unchangeable, and eternal; to vindicate the permanency of truth is to dispute without an adversary."† One of greater authority has given us the cautionary advice, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try (*dokimazete, prove, test as by fire*) the spirits, whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world," I John iv. 1. Again, another inspired teacher says, "Prove (*dokimazete, test*) all things, hold fast that which is good," I Thess. v. 21. This duty should be performed with a sincere desire to know the truth, and no false fire should be brought into the arena. Calmness, not fierceness, should characterize all

* "The Kingdom of God," Part I., by Orson Pratt. Mr. Pratt is "an apostle of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints," and has been accustomed to receive revelations for eighteen years. He received a revelation as long since as Nov. 1830, in which God says to him, "You are my son, and blessed are you, because you have believed; and more blessed are you, because you are called of me to preach my gospel, to lift up your voice as with the sound of a trump, both long and loud. Therefore prophecy, and it shall be given by the power of the Holy Ghost." (Book of "Doctrine and Covenants," page 208.) This was probably the first revelation he received. One of the recent revelations is concerning the materiality of all existence, and bears date in the tract, "The Kingdom of God," Oct. 31st, 1848. He is the chief of the Mormons in England, and they must yield obedience in all things to him. Probably he only produces authorized publications.

† Essay "On Truth," Part I.

our investigations. It is always well to remember the advice of Herbert:—

> "Be calm in arguing, for fierceness makes
> Error a fault and truth discourtesy."

The chief object of this treatise is an examination of the system of the Mormons, so far as it relates to their notion of a Supreme Being. This notion is set forth in the tract beforementioned, viz.: "The Kingdom of God." The examiner has nothing to do with the introductory remarks of that tract, concerning the governments upon earth of human origin. He has nothing to say for or against the divine right of kings. The author may hold his opinions concerning "empires, kingdoms, principalities, republics" being "corrupt, illegal, unauthorized powers," that "all emperors, kings, princes, presidents, lords, nobles, and rulers, act without authority." It will not disturb his quiet; and as he is neither a sovereign of a realm, nor of the titled nobility, and never likely to become so, he feels no alarm. It is well for Mr. Orson Pratt, however, although "*an apostle*," that he published such things in this land of true liberty, and not among any of the continental nations, or doubtless under such alarming symptoms as have recently shown, and still show themselves, he would not live to furnish "the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints" with any more such discoveries as those developed in his small treatise.

The writer's business is chiefly with his views of the Divine Being, especially those which divest Him of His *spirituality omnipresence*, and in some respects of His *moral nature*. The author says "*God is a material being*,"—"*He cannot be every where present*,"—"*there is no such thing as moral image*." But while he denies omnipresence to the Father and the Son, he ascribes it to the *third person* of the *Trinity*. "God the Holy Spirit is omnipresent;" and says, "*It* exists in vast *immeasurable quantities* in connexion with all material worlds." That "the atoms" of which the Holy Spirit consists "exist in *inexhaustible quantities*, which is the *only possible* way for any *substance* to be *omnipresent*."

These and the like discoveries it is purposed to consider, because of their importance. These things are either true or false. If they are true, they are inexpressibly valuable; if they are false, they are contemptibly worthless. If true, they are excellent; if false they are an imposture. If true,

they are tremendously so; if false, it is reasonable to be indifferent concerning them, and to esteem them with that levity which they deserve. They appear to be,

I. IRRATIONAL, opposed to TRUE PHILOSOPHY.

II. UNSCRIPTURAL and ANTI-SCRIPTURAL.

III. OF NO UTILITY to MAN, and DEROGATORY to GOD.

I. The Philosophy of the Mormons is IRRATIONAL.

1. It has been customary with some authors to consider man as a complex being, a tripartite person, having a body, a soul, and a spirit. This doctrine is not only very ancient, but has claim to high authority. The ancient heathen philosophers who thus distinguished man, were the Pythagoreans, the Platonists and the Stoics. The Christian Fathers were also of the same opinion, viz: Irenœus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origin, and Ignatius. Josephus, the Jewish historian, most probably held the same opinion. The greatest authority, however, that can be brought in confirmation of this doctrine is, that such a division is made in the sacred volume. Saint Paul divides man into three parts, viz: "the Spirit, the Soul, and the Body." 1 Thess. v. 23. This verse might be collated with Genesis ii. 7. "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, (the body), and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; (the spirit), and man became a living soul," (the living sensitive part.) In this respect man may be considered very justly as a faint emblem of the existence of the Godhead, as Saint Augustine observes, "*Homo habet tres partes, spiritum, animam, et corpus; itaque homo est imago S. S. Trinitatis.*"*

The *spirit* is the purely *immaterial* part, which is capable of separation from the body, and can exist independently of the body.

The *soul* is something distinct from that which is pure spirit. It is the seat of the affections, but is frequently used in a sense synonimous with pure mind or spirit. Matt. x. 28, Mark viii., 36, 37.

The *body* is that *material* part, "formed out of the dust of the ground," and is the *medium* through which the *mind* is *manifested.*

* Man has three parts, the spirit, the soul, and the body; therefore man is an image of the Holy Trinity."—(Mason's Self Knowledge, c. 2.)

2. As therefore, the soul is frequently held as immaterial and synonimous with the mind or spirit, it is necessary only to consider spirit and matter.

In reasoning on such subjects as this which is now presented, it is of the utmost importance to avoid, as far as possible, the use of metaphor. The indiscreet use of figurative language has done great injury to science, but in the philosophy of the mind, it is impossible to keep clear of metaphor.* All those who have treated on the mind, whether materialists or immaterialists, have been accustomed to use metaphorical terms. Dugald Stewart says, "They alone who have studied with care the science of human nature, can be fully sensible how difficult it is, on the one hand, for the clearest and most cautious thinkers to describe its phenomena in definite and unequivocal terms; and how easy it is, on the other, for the most superficial critic to cavil, with plausibility, at the best phraseology which language can afford."† Let it therefore be observed, that in the following reasoning, the word *soul* will be generally avoided, but should it be used, it will be in that popular sense which makes it synonymous with mind or spirit unless when stated to the contrary.

3. The immortal Locke, a name which stands first in mental science, in his consideration of the sources of human knowledge, fell into an error which ultimately led to the pure *idealism* of Berkeley and Hume.

Nothing could have been farther from the intention of that remarkable metaphysician than to lay a foundation for Hume's refined atheism. Locke adopted the maxims of the *Logicians*, "There is nothing in the *intellect* which was not first in the sense," and he considered the mind of man, as a *tabula rasa*, or perfect blank. "The steps by which the mind attains several truths, are," he says, "1st. The senses let in particular ideas and furnish the yet empty cabinet; they are lodged in the memory and names got to them."‡ Again, he says; "Let us suppose the mind to be, as we say, white paper, void of all characters, without any ideas; how comes it to be furnished?"‖ He answers, "by experience and sensation." He then says that "consciousness *constitutes* our personal identity." Bishop Butler observes, "consciousness, per-

* Beattie on Truth, Part 1. c. 1. † Philosophical Essays, p. 147.
‡ Locke on the Human Understanding, Book I. c. 2, §§ 15.
‖ Ibid, Book II. c. 1, §§ 2, 3.

sonal identity *pre-supposes*, and therefore *cannot* constitute personal *identity*, any more than knowledge, in any other case, can constitute truth, which it pre-supposes."* However, from this source, or as Bishop Butler calls it, "wonderful mistake," Berkeley drew his system of *idealism* and pronounced the *existence* of *matter impossible.*

> ——————————We are such stuff
> As dreams are made of, and our little life
> Is rounded with a sleep .....SHAKESPEAR (Tempest.)

Berkeley, however, thought that if his principles were successfully propogated, "Atheism and scepticism would be utterly destroyed." † Hume advanced in his philosophy to the terminus of the system, and as Berkeley like Locke had made our ideas of taste and colours lie not in the bodies, but merely in the senses; he made beauty and deformity, virtue and vice to lie there too. Here was the perfection of his sceptical theory, which he called "a sceptical solution of sceptical doubts," that is, a doubtful solution of doubtful doubts. The obvious effect of this theory and that of the Mormons will be, that there is no existence whatever. This conclusion from the conjoined systems is too glaring to be admitted, and yet each system is supported by equally tenable arguments, and built upon an equally sure foundation.

4. It is presumed therefore, that most men, if they agree not in the qualities and properties of that which exists, agree at least in this, that *something exists.* They will not therefore with Des Cartes reject all evidence, of sense, of intuition, and of mathematical demonstration; to doubt of every thing of which it is possible to doubt and to be persuaded that every thing is false, and then like the same philosopher to presume that he thinks, and from that presumption to draw the inference that he exists "Ego cogito ergo sum."‡

Take then, as a principle in common with materialists and with the Mormons, that there is *something* which is *cognizant* to the *senses*, a real, separate, tangible *something which exists* and which we call *matter* or *body.* You believe this because you cannot but believe it. You believe it, because you must believe it. When you *touch* a *stone* you are *conscious* of a certain sensation which you call a *sensation* of *hardness.* The sensation is not hardness, but a feeling in

* Dissertation on Personal Identity.

† Preface to Dialogues. ‡ "I think therefore I am."

your mind, accompanied with an *irresistible belief* that the sensation is occasioned by the application of an external and hard substance to some part of your body. You can neither avoid the sensation nor the belief. You must believe whether you will or not. You cannot prove that it exists, it is incapable of demonstration, but you are certain of its existence. This intuitive belief you consider to be in accordance with the law of your nature and the constitution of that nature. * The same principle of intuition proves the existence of spirit or mind. But more of this in the sequel.

Matter includes variety, size and form. It is governed by certain laws which philosophers call "*natural laws*," such as attraction and gravitation. The smallest atom which can be discovered with the most powerful microscope possesses the same properties and is influenced by the same laws as those stupenduous bodies, which like so many lamps suspended in a vast arch, adorn and variegate the heavens. One principle exercises a power over all, whether it be the dust on which we tread or the universe of which the earth forms a part. All matter has length, breadth and thickness as necessary properties. It is capable also of the relative qualities of colour, size, form, and weight. The former are what Dugald Stewart calls "the mathematical affections of matter." †

5. "Astronomy demonstrates a system of impelling, resisting and counterbalancing forces which carry with them the strongest evidences of an Almighty Creator." ‡ One of the first sentiments which effects the mind contemplating the works of nature is that *immense power* which is every where displayed. Turn our eyes in any direction throughout the whole universe and *almighty power* is to be seen. The architect who formed these heavens and these worlds, the sea and the dry land; and upholds them by the arm of his power. He who created and then fixed in their respective places those wondrous bodies which throng the heavens, must possess *immense power* It was

"The Almighty power of God,
Which made the mountains rise;
That spread the flowing seas abroad,
And built the lofty skies."

* Beattie on Truth, Part I, c. 2.
† Philosophical Essays, p. 153. ‡ Dr. J. Pye Smith.

"The spirituality of the Deity is intimately connected with the possession of that infinite unlimited power. There is a vulgar prejudice in favour of matter and against spirit, as if the former were possessed of great force, while the latter is only invested with a feeble degree of energy. This prejudice arises from our mistaking secondary and remote effects for causes—seeing the mechanical forces exerted through the medium of matter, we are thence led to suppose that to be the source of power." * Thus we terminate our ideas of power in matter, whereas it is mind, and *mind alone* which is the *seat* of *power*.

To give a correct definition of the simple idea *power* is perhaps impossible, but we know that *motion* is caused by *power*. So also, we cannot define *motion*. It is exquisite jargon to say that motion is "the act of being in power, as far forth, as in power." † *Motion is not the natural state of matter*. Matter tends to quiesence; left alone, it settles into rest. But we find *matter* in *motion* and *regulated motion*. A complex machinery, but withal majestically simple. There must have been a First Mover. Matter could not move itself, it must receive an impulse, and from the various yet admirably harmonious motions which we see it possesses, the undoubted conviction is forced on our minds that there must exist something extraneous from matter, to design, commence and sustain these motions. How easily is all this understood when the Mosaic account of the creation is taken into consideration! The Divine Being "speaks and it is done, he commands and it stands fast." He said, "Let there be light and there was light." No causes intervene between the volition and the effect produced. Well might Saint Paul style the great First Cause "the blessed and only Potentate." This reasoning is substantiated by the discoveries lately made by professor Whewell, and which confirm the suppositions of Sir Isaac Newton, that there is an extremely subtle fluid diffused through all space. Professor Whewell, in his Bridgewater Treatise, has observed that in consequence of the resisting medium of this attenuated substance, the planet Jupiter will lose one thousandth part of its velocity, in its orbit, in seventy millions of years. This counteracting principle will in sufficient time bring the solar system to a stand still, unless the Divine Artificer should

* Robert Hall. † Locke, B. III., c. 4, sec 8.

again interpose. * Does this prove that the subtle substance thus extended throughout space is capable of motion *per se*? It *resists* motion. The Mormons make "the Holy Spirit to consist of atoms in inexhaustible quantities extending through all space and intermingling with all other matter," and yet to be "an intelligent, all-wise and all-powerful material substance," contradicting their own dogma that the matter of which the Father's person is composed "cannot occupy the same identical space with other matter;" how then can the material atoms of the Holy Spirit "extend *through all space* and *intermingle* with *all other matter?* It contradicts their infamous and impious assertion that as "the Father and Son cannot be every where present, it is therefore impossible for them to attend in *person* to all the multiplied affairs of government among intelligent beings, therefore God, in establishing a government among such beings, has always called persons of their own number to officiate in his name."† Such *luminous intelligences*, as Orson Pratt, are the *governmental officials*. But why not give such authority and delegate such power to "the inexhaustible atoms" of the Holy Spirit, "which extend through all space and intermingle with all matter?" The *bold impiety* of this statement will be a *brand* of *infamy* as long as the system of Mormonism is known among men. This sublime discovery of the wonderful works of God, does prove, that matter is incapable, in and of itself to originate motion—that the beautiful and visible system of things had a commencement and if left to itself would have an end—"that the beginning was not from blind chance—not from dead matter—not from a cause which might justly be called nothing, but from a cause of

* What is the visible system but a vast piece of machinery, a natural clockwork, under the inspection of the infinite and eternal Mind! Of Him "who sits on the circle of the heavens!" "By him all things consist," Col. i. 17, are harmoniously united and cemented together. This idea is beautifully expressed in the following lines, said to be written over the sun-dial in the porch of the church at Seaham, in the county of Durham.

"The natural clockwork, by the Mighty One,
Wound up at first—it ever since has run.
No pin drops out, its wheels and springs hold good,
It speaks its Maker's praise, though once it stood;
But that was by the order of the Workman's pow'r,
And when it stands again, it goes no more."

"They all shall *wax old*, as doth a garment." (Heb. i. 11.)

† Tract "The Kingdom of God," Part I., p. 5.

the highest intellectual majesty, a power, a mind comprehending all things, and an energy capable of commanding and combining all things, and making every atom, and the largest masses of atoms, to conspire to the production of one great and glorious end. A design implies a designer; a system implies an author and arranger. Such a design, such a system, is the operation of an intelligent principle; that intelligent principle is a mind; that *mind* is *God.*"*

6 The existence of *mind* or of an *immaterial substance* is evident, from the fact, that *man is a thinking being.*

What is meant by *an immaterial substance* is merely this, that something exists which is *not matter* and is evidently *distinct* from matter, which is *not dependent* on matter for its existence and which possesses properties and qualities *entirely different* from those possessed by matter. That this immaterial existence is frequently found in connexion with a peculiar organization of matter does not prove that it is dependent on such organization for its existence. The distinction between matter and mind is very apparent, although we may not be able to define how these two dissimilar natures are united together. Mind is simple not compounded. Mind is not perceivable to corporeal organs, matter is so perceivable. All the qualities of matter are not comparable with the more excellent qualities of mind; such as power and intelligence. Mind thinks, matter cannot think.

It is the *existence* of this *thinking principle* which clearly *proves* the *immateriality* of the *mind* or *spirit.*

That man is capable of thinking cannot be disputed, either this power must proceed from matter or it must not. Des Cartes thought the soul, that is, the immaterial substance, to have its seat in the *pineal* gland, a little round body, about the size of a pea, formed of grey matter and situated in the brain, just above the part where the *medulla oblongata*, or spinal marrow is united to the brain. It would be absurd for any one to attempt to explain how the spirit and the body are united, or whether the spirit be diffused throughout the whole body or confined to a particular part. It may be laid down however as a proposition, that *the brain is either the mind or the organ of the mind.*† If the brain be the mind, then

* Dr. J. Pye Smith.

† The brain is the organ of the mind. The mind perceives through the medium of the brain. Physiology teaches that if the optic nerve be severed,

the properties of mind, such as *perception*, *memory*, *judgment*, *thinking*, &c., are merely the productions of the brain, just as the bile is the production of the liver, the saliva of the salivary glands, the tears of the lachrymal glands, &c. Let these mental productions be exercised for a short period by the reader. How do you distinguish between any two given substances, such as, that a block of stone is not a log of wood? Because they possess different qualities. So also you distinguish between mind and matter. You are ignorant of the essence of each. You can no more comprehend matter than mind. The individual who says, he will believe that only which he can comprehend, is unworthy of argument; for if true to his principle, he would negative his own existence, for he cannot comprehend himself:

——————"I tremble at myself,
And in myself am lost." (YOUNG, Night 1st.)

But still I believe in my own existence. The properties of body, are size, weight, solidity, resistance, &c.; those of the mind are joy, hope, fear, &c.; but weight is not joy, resistance is not hope, size is not fear; therefore, as a block of stone is not a log of wood; so mind is not matter.

If the mind be material and the brain nothing but a large gland secreting the various affections of thought, hope, joy, memory, &c., then all these affections or qualities are material, and must be also little particles of matter, of different forms and dimensions, and perhaps also of various colours. Then we might with the utmost propriety, without the shadow of an absurdity, logically say, "the twentieth part of our belief, the half of a hope, the top of memory, the corner of a fear, the north side of a doubt," &c. Mind then is not matter. Materialism is not only relatively but absolutely absurd. If mind be matter, or matter mind, then we may have the square or cube of joy or grief, of pain or pleasure. We may divide a great joy into a number of little joys, or we may accumulate a great joy by heaping together the solid parts of several little joys. We shall then have the colour and shape of a thought.

there will be no perception of light, although the eye may remain perfect and uninjured. If the skull press on the brain, the effect will be seen in a loss of memory and consciousness. The conclusion follows that the brain is the organ of the mind. The mind thinks and feels through this apparatus. It is the instrument through which the mind is manifested. It is no more the mind than a musical instrument is music.

It will be either white, grey, brown, crimson, purple, or it may be a mixture of two or more colours. Then we shall have a dark grey hope, a bright yellow sorrow, a round brown tall pain, and an octagonal green belief; an inch of thought, a mile of joy. He would not have a *grain* of sense who believes such absurdities. There would then be great philosophy in the saying of the blind man, who on being asked "what the colour scarlet was like?" gave for an answer, that "it was like the sound of a trumpet." Mr. Orson Pratt calls matter into existence of which the world knows but little. He has not only "intelligent" matter, but "all-wise" and "all-powerful" matter. This matter is capable of division into parts; for all matter has length, breadth, and thickness. Then we shall have the half of an intelligent atom of matter, the eighth of an all-wise atom, the thousandth part of an all-powerful atom, &c. Such are the absurdities which "*the Latter Day Saint*" embraces, and on which he is to suspend not merely his *judgment*, but his *salvation*. The great apostle of the Mormons, Orson Pratt, says, that without the right understanding of these things "you can in no wise be saved."

There is another conclusion equally absurd if the existence of an immaterial substance be denied and thinking be ascribed to matter, and that is, the mind must always think in the same way, in the same direction. "If man" says Dr. Priestley "be a material being, and the power of thinking the result of a certain organization of the brain, does it not follow, that all his functions must be regulated by the laws of mechanism, and that of consequence, all his actions proceed from an irresistable necessity." He says again, "the doctrine of necessity is the immediate result of the doctrine of the materiality of man; for *mechanism is the undoubted consequence of materialism.*" So also Priestley's follower, Darwin, says, that "ideas are material things," "they are contractions, motions or configurations of the fibres of the organs of sense." Here is the real *perfection* of *materialism! It destroys man's accountability to God!* There is then no such thing as praise or blame, fear or hope, reward or punishment, and, consequently, no religion. How can the Mormons reconcile this conclusion with their religious fabric, built on revelations and visions? By the bye, how do they obtain these said revelations? If *their God* be a material being, he must *necessarily act mechanically*. Therefore all his visions and revelations must be through some ma-

terial medium, and not, as immaterialists would suppose, by spirit operating on spirit, it must be body acting on body. The vision then must be some subtle gas coming from the great seat of the fluid to the individual man. It must be a material substance for it cannot be immaterial—that being, in accordance with Orson Pratt's vocabulary, "nothing." If they deny its being a *substance*, then you may take it as an index of their creed, in which there is nothing *solid* or *substantial* to the mind of a reasonable person. There is a hint which may be thrown out, for the special benefit of these "*saints*," rather "*late*" in this, because they have had no revelation about it as yet. They say the spirit is material. They will grant that death is the separation of the soul from the body. Now, they may keep their spirits on earth, if they only provide themselves with a few articles at a trifling expense. And, moreover, they may be in no anxiety about the spirits of departed friends being in prison, without being able to release them at pleasure. They have only to provide themselves with a bottle sufficiently large, (Orson Pratt will be able to tell them of the size and shape), and let it be well stoppered and luted down, and as the *material* or *gaseous* spirit, whether oxygen, carbon, or a compound gas, leaves the body, it must be caught in the bottle and there preserved—neatly labelled and placed in some conspicuous place in their dwellings. It is equally easy for them to do this, as for the chemist to preserve his gas. They will be able chemically to examine and test it; try its weight and volume and the quality of the atoms of which it is composed.

Doubtless they will find it extremely powerful and particularly so if concentrated. One caution they should receive. If it prove a similar gas to that of the vapour of *æther* or *chloroform*, it would be well strongly to advise them, however much they might desire to inhale the substance, to be extremely cautious and not attempt such a thing, unless they have some *elder* or *priest* of *their church* present, who could relieve them by his restoratives. Well may the words of La Fontaine be used in reference to such absurdities.

"Quintessence d' atome, extrait de la lumiére."

The reader may have heard of pills being made from the *rays* of the *sun*, "Pilulæ radiis solis extractum;" but the spirit of man is too subtle a material substance for reduction to such a use. Such are the glaring absurdities of this Mormo-material scheme. They weary the mind, while they offend the nobler

moral sentiments, and therefore are unworthy of any farther pursuit in this direction.

7. The last consideration which it is necessary to advance for the real existence of mind, is *consciousness*.

The *highest degree of evidence* of which the *truth* is capable is *intuition*. This, the first principle of evidence, is the common standard of truth, and is that *common sense* which leads men to form correct notions of things. By the senses man becomes acquainted with the existence of external things—the material world. By *consciousness*, or the *internal sense*, he becomes acquainted with the *existence* and *identity* of his own mind. This is *direct* evidence, it is *intuitive*, and that man may, with justice be considered as beside himself, who doubts such evidence. It is the dictate of *common sense*, an *intuitive truth*, and by the *law* of *his nature* he *does* and *must believe* it. The contrary of this is absurd. It may be asked, on what ground the Mormons would prove their own personal identity? The attrition which is constantly going on in the body, makes it impossible for them even to define identity. It is generally considered that in a few years our bodies are entirely changed. How then, on the material scheme, can a Mormon tell that he is the same person *now* that he was *twenty years since*, or shall be *ten years hence?* The matter is continually changing. It is like the Athenian galley, which was sent every year to Delos. Plutarch tells us, "that in the time of Demetrius Phalereus, the Athenians still preserved the custom of sending every year to Delos the same galley, which about a thousand years before, had brought Theseus and his company from Crete; and that it then used to be a question in the schools, how this could be the same vessel, when every part of its materials had been changed more than once." But, supposing the mind to be immaterial, and the definition of identity is easy and simple, for it is identity of "the principle which feels and thinks, without reference to the changeable state of the particles of the brain, or of the body in general.*

8. Orson Pratt says, "The Father is a material being." "The elementary materials of his body are not susceptible of occupying, *at the same time*, the *same identical space* with *other matter*;" and "a *spirit* is as much *matter* as *oxygen* or *hydrogen*. It has many properties in common with other

* Dr. Thomas Brown's "Philosophy of the Human Mind." Lecture 12.

matter."* The spirit of man, then, is matter, and how can the *spiritual* matter occupy the same space with the matter of which the body consists? In the book of "Doctrines and Covenants," put forth by the Mormons, it is said, "the spirit and the body are the soul;"† and again, "man is spirit."‡ Now, what is the soul according to this theory? Matter also? No doubt Orson Pratt would so judge. It cannot be immaterial. "Immateriality," he tells us, "is only another name for nothing," but the soul is something. It must be "a man beside himself." Verily, that man must be Orson Pratt!

9. In the book of "Doctrines and Covenants," it is put as an objection of the opposer of the system—"Where is your God?"§ Truly this may be put. But Orson Pratt would answer in his style, that "the king occasionally visited his subjects in ancient times, and once tarried with them for several years; but he received such cruel abuse from many of the people, that he left them, and went to some other part of his dominions. Where the king is gone the people cannot tell."‖ Or he would say, that the "Holy Spirit extends through all space intermingling with all *other* matter;"¶ and then he might quote the words of Lucan, "Jupiter est quodcunque vides."** Simonides being asked by Dionysius the tyrant, *what God was*? desired a day's time to consider of it before he made his reply. When the day was expired, he desired two days; and afterwards, instead of returning his answer, demanded still double the time to consider it. This great poet and philosopher, the more he contemplated the nature of the Deity, found that he waded the more out of his depth; and that he lost himself in the thought, instead of finding an end of it.†† Orson Pratt has no such difficulty; he unhesitatingly informs you, as a certain, yea, a revealed truth, from God himself, that "he is a material being," and that he does not "materially differ" in "*size*" from "*a man*"—that "man resembles him in the *features* and *form* of his *body*."

* "The Kingdom of God," Part I., p. 4, Orson Spencer says in like manner, "The most subtle and refined spirit conceivable, is a *material* existence as far removed from immateriality as the east is from the west." (Letter 8.) But in the 5th Letter he says, the Holy Ghost is "an *unembodied* personage." So that *matter* is *unembodied*, or it is *matter* and not *matter*.

† Page 97. ‡ Ibid, p. 246. § Page 294.

‖ "The Kingdom of God," Part I., p. 2. ¶ Ibid, Part I., p. 3.

** Whatever you see is God. †† Addison, "Attributes of God," p. 78.

And will this puny mortal man, and this worm of the earth, liken the *Supreme* and incomprehensible *Jehovah* to himself? "To whom will ye liken me? saith the Lord,"—to a pigmy, a worm? Where is the perfection of the Deity? In this absurd system there is no perfection in God. If the soul, released from the body, should take her flight and continue to penetrate into the infinity of space for millions and millions of years, she would then find herself as near the Creator as when she first set out; she would still be within the centre of His vast empire and presence. "God's centre is everywhere and His circumference nowhere." Man is not left to the [illegible]ous inductions of philosophy to assure himself of the existence of mind, or the fact that there is an All-wise, All-powerful, and Omnipresent God; he is assured of it. Scoffers may wrangle and mockers may blaspheme; but he has evidence sufficient to satisfy his mind of its own existence, and of the existence of a great *First Cause and Designing Infinite Mind.*

"What am I, whence produced, and for what end?
Whence drew I being, to what period tend?
Am I the abandon'd orphan of blind chance,
Dropp'd by wild atoms in disorder'd dance?
Or from an endless chain of causes wrought,
And of unthinking substance, born with thought—
Am I but what I seem, mere flesh and blood,
A branching channel with a mazy flood?
The purple stream that through my vessels glides,
Dull and unconscious flows, like common tides;
The pipes, through which the circling juices stray,
Are not that thinking I, no more than they!
This frame, compacted with transcendent skill,
Of moving joints, obedient to my will;
Nurs'd from the fruitful glebe, like yonder tree,
Waxes and wastes—I call it mine, not me.
New matter still the mould'ring mass sustains;
The mansion chang'd, the tenant still remains;
And from the fleeting stream repair'd by food,
Distinct, as is the swimmer from the flood."—*Arbuthnot.*

It is clearly shown from the arguments adduced, that materialism, or Mr. Orson Pratt's Mormonism, is absurd, irrational, and unphilosophical. And yet, this is the system which men of reason are called on, with all the authority heaven can bestow, to embrace, and yield up their judgments to be led by such ignorant and presumptuous teachers, who have yet to learn the first rudiments of philosophy. The very deist will

smile at such credulity, if we should be found so weak; for there is more reason in his belief, erroneous though it be, than in this refined materialism, only equalled in the refined *atheism* of Hobbes and Spinoza. Perhaps our *inspired* author and *apostle* imagined he was about to raise a system which would defy all the sages of the present time to demolish; and what is the real case?

> "Deceiving bliss! in bitter shame it ends,
> His prop a cobwed, which an insect rends."

II. The Materialism of the Mormons is not only Unscriptural but Anti-Scriptural.

1. The writer receives the Bible as the sure word of testimony, not written by fallible man, but by the power and wisdom of the Eternal. "Not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." I Cor. ii. 13. He hopes therefore, that the reader will not as a mere speculist endeavour to ascertain the meaning of the sacred volume, but having ascertained, will, with devout and hallowed feelings, present a reasonable service to Him, who is revealed in that sacred book.

2. It is to be feared that the absurd glosses and incoherent comments which have been made on the sacred text, have given too great scope to the enemies of the faith for the charge of inconsistency and nonsense. Corruptions have been introduced into the church, in all ages and in an endless variety of shape; but there has been this one peculiar characteristic, that however diversified the form, however gorgeous the drapery, or great the *eclat* which has attended their introduction, they have had a striking peculiarity in their deformity, which has never been successfully concealed. Strange to say, many of these forms of error have made the Holy Scriptures the ground of their appeal. Some, not even satisfied with the canon of the sacred books, have added, in opposition to all testimony and veracity, their own *terrestrial* production, and elevating it to the altitude of the heavenly oracles, yea even with its beams of light, have arrogantly and presumptuously claimed for it the *same credence* as is cheerfully accorded to the former. They then boisterously denounce all who give not the same heed to their fondling; notwithstanding the dark and deep *earthly* lineaments too visible on its features. Too many of these sects have tortured the word of God, so as to make it speak any and every language, however discordant or jarring. "Every party,

one would think, fancies itself possessed of the only key to the heavenly treasure contained in the Bible. Certain it is, that every party finds things there which none but themselves can discover. The true partisan, of whatever party he be, neglecting the plain declarations of scripture (which are far the most numerous) as of no moment, recurs, chiefly, for the *support of his system*, to those passages wherein there is *some difficulty*. Again, when it suits his purpose, renouncing the use of common sense, what the ordinary idioms of language and rules of interpretation require to be understood figuratively, he explains literally; what, on the contrary, the scope of the context requires to be understood as literal, he explains as figurative. The scriptures are neither ambiguous nor obscure; but men's judgments are pre-engaged ere they examine them."*

3. There are four things expressed in the tract, to which we have already alluded, on which it is desirable to offer a few remarks, showing they are unscriptural and anti-scriptural. The tract is widely circulated by the Latter Day Saints as infalliby true. The author says, "God has a body, parts, and passions; can go from place to place,—can eat, drink, and talk as well as man. Man resembles him in the features and form of his body, and he does not differ materially in size."† These two sentences have reference to the form of existence of the Godhead, and with the expression "The Father is a material being,"‡ are in opposition to the *spirituality* of the Divinity.

"The substance of his (the Father's) person occupies space the same as other matter. The elementary materials of his body are not susceptible of occupying at the same time, the space with other matter. The substance of his person, like other matter, cannot be in two places at the same instant. It also requires *time* for him to transport himself from place to place."§ This is asserted as "equally applicable to the person of the Son." Here is a denial of the infinity of God the Father and God the Son.

"The human race are 'his offspring,' made in his (God's) likeness and image, not after his moral image, but after the image of his person. There is no such thing as moral image. Such an image cannot exist. Morality is a property of some

* Dr. G. Campbell's "Spirit of the Gospel."
† "The Kingdom of God," Part I., p. 4.
‡ Ibid, Part I., p. 4. § Ibid, Part I., p. 4.

being or substance. A property without a being or substance to which it appertains is inconceivable. A property can never have figure, shape, or image of any kind. Hence, a moral image never had an existence except in the brains of modern idolators."* This is in opposition to the moral perfections of the Godhead.

The Holy Spirit being one *part* of the Godhead, is also a material substance, of the same nature and properties in many respects, as the Spirits of the Father and Son. *It* exists in vast immeasurable quantities in connexion with all material worlds. This is called God in the scriptures, as well as the Father and the Son. God the Father and God the Son cannot be everywhere present; indeed, they cannot be even in two places at the same instant: but God the Holy Spirit is omnipresent—*it* extends through all space, intermingling with all other matter, yet no one atom of the Holy Spirit can be in two places at the same instant, which in all cases is an absolute impossibility. *It must* exist in inexhaustible quantities, which is the only possible way for any substance to be omnipresent. All the innumerable phenomena of universal nature are produced by the actual presence of this intelligent, all-wise, and all-powerful *material* substance called the Holy Spirit. *It* is the most *active matter* in the universe; producing all its operations according to *fixed* and *definite* laws enacted by *itself*, in conjunction with the Father and the Son."† From this extract the inference is drawn that the author's system consists of *Three Gods* or Tritheism, denying the unity of the Godhead; or that these three material substances make *one God*, each being only a part in the Deity. On each of these points it is desirable to ascertain the sense of scripture, and to test the truth or falsehood of this novel scheme.

4. The *Spiritual Existence* of God is a fact distinctly and fully revealed in the sacred oracles.

It is true, that material elements are at times ascribed to him; but who, unless he be a Mormon, would therefore conclude, in opposition to *express* declarations of His spiritual nature, that he has a *fleshy body*; only because in a few obscure and figurative passages, He is arrayed in the mortal attributes of man. Who would conceive such humiliating views of the incomprehensible Supreme; now that "life and immortality are brought to light," except he were given over

* "The Kingdom of God," Part I., p. 4. † Ibid, Part I., p. 5.

judicially "to believe a lie," and thus his eyes were blinded. 2 Thess. ii, 8, 12. This theory however is not of yesterday. It is as old at least as the days of Homer. He speaks in his Odyssey (17, 485-6) of the gods visiting the earth in human form. *He* did not require a revelation to attain to such a high mystery; but these philosophical theologians of our day can do nothing and know nothing, without a revelation. Surely, Shakespear was speaking prophetically of the Mormons, not of the Poets, when he penned the lines:—

"The Poet's eye, in a fine frenzy rolling," &c. *Midsummer Night's Dream.*

It should have been thus:—

"The *Mormon's* eye, in a fine frenzy rolling,
Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven,
And as imagination bodies forth
The forms of things unknown, the *Mormon's* pen
Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing
A local habitation and a name."

As already observed, the sacred text is made to speak any language and every language. Words and sentences are taken either literally or figuratively, as it most pleases the upholder of a system, without regard to the canon of interpretation.

In the case of the angels' visit to Abraham and their partaking of food, who would conclude they must have fleshy bodies like the Mormons; and that one of them, to whom a divine title is given, possessed the same attributes as man. The occurrence is one altogether supernatural, and done in mercy to man's weakness and the infant state of the then knowledge of God. It might be assumed with equal propriety that the Divine Being is "a rock," "a fortress," "a tower," "a shield," "a buckler," because he is so styled in the Bible. Let a few brief passages of scripture be quoted on this point, and then let the reader judge; only desiring him to remember that, one passage of scripture if obscure should not be interpreted by another *more* obscure, but by one *less* obscure. For instance, it is said, "God is a *Spirit*," and again it is said, "a spirit hath not flesh and bones." These are express declarations illustrative of each other, and it is thence concluded with the utmost propriety, that the Spirit of God, or God, is of an entirely different nature from that mortal frame which man possesses, and also, that the spirit which inhabits the mortal tabernacle resembles the Divine Being, and thus the expression is comprehended, that "man was made in the image of God."

Now, if such an obscure passage, as that, to which reference has been made, be collated with these, ought a reasonable person to conclude that "God is a material being?" To draw such a conclusion, such a testimony as the following would not be sufficient: that "God is flesh." That would only balance her testimony, and as both could not be believed, seeing they ditectly contradict each other; then neither must be believed which would be that God is nothing—that it is *immaterial* which is believed, and "*immateriality*," according to our author is "*nothing*." Or if the declaration of the author of the tract be taken, as inspired, that "the Father is a material being," there is still the same dilemma. You cannot tell which to believe, both cannot be true, and therefore you conclude, God is nothing. But when you take such obscure passages, as the following, of the Lord eating with Abraham (Gen. xviii. 8) and of his showing himself in his glory to Moses (Exod. xxxiii. 23) and set them in comparison with "God is a spirit," and "a spirit hath not flesh and bones," you conclude, and justly too, that these *bodily forms* were *assumed* in *mercy* to man. For had God appeared in all his glory, we should have been ready to say with Job, "withdraw thy hand far from me, and let not thy dread make me afraid." (Job xiii, 21.) In the same case of Job, the more important because he lived about the time of Abraham, and was a man highly favoured of God. God had "made an hedge about him," so that Satan could not touch him. Was it an hedge of *bricks* or *stones?* Satan saith to the Lord "put forth thine hand now and touch his bone and his flesh and he will curse thee to thy face. And the Lord said to Satan, behold he is in thine hand. (Job ii, 5-6.) Job says, he receives "*it*" from the *hand* of *God* whether "good" or "evil." (2 c. 10 v.) Again he says "The arrows of the Almighty are within me." (6 c. 4 v.) Had then the Almighty really shot *material* arrows at Job, and were they left undrawn? Again, "Am I a sea or a whale, that thou settest a *watch* over me?—thou scarest me with dreams and terrifiest me through *visions:* What is man that thou shouldest magnify him? and that thou shouldest set thine heart upon him? And that thou shouldest *visit* him *every morning* and try him every moment? How long wilt thou not *depart from me*—thou shalt *seek* me in the morning and I shall not be." (7c. 12 to 21 v.) It is evident that these visions were not of God, for he desired to see him. He says "Oh, that I knew where I might find him,"

&c. (23 c. 3 10 v.) And when he had no *direct vision*, but in God's providence towards him, he says, "I have *heard* of thee by the *hearing* of the *ear*, but *now* mine *eye seeth thee*." (42 c. 5 v.) There is evident proof here, that these things are not to be taken literally. If so, then when Job says "withdraw thy hand from me," he mistakes the hand of Satan for that of God; for he was in Satan's hand. "The Lord said unto Satan, Behold he is in thine hand." (2 c. 6 v.)

Now, when you read "I have made the earth by my outstretched arm," Jer. xxvii. 5; or "the arm of the Lord is revealed," Isa. liii. 1. "The Lord hath made bare his holy arm," Isa. lii. 10, you understand that God's power is manifested in the first instance by the creation of the earth, and in the other instances, that the hidden power which was kept secret for ages, was revealed in Christ as the Saviour, when by his teaching and miracles he proved his divine mission. If this Mormon scheme be correct, then God should have been *often seen* by the Jews, and there need not to have been so much prominence given to these instances, as he might have been seen daily. God promised that he would "*walk*" among them. "I will walk among you, and will be your God," Levit. xxvi. 12. It is true then that God can walk, or as Orson Pratt says, "go from place to place." But do the Jewish historians refer to such a thing? The expression implies Divine watchfulness and protection; and you would say with Job, "God is not a man, as I am," Job ix. 32.

This scheme contradicts itself; for if Christ were possessed of a body of flesh and blood, how could he become incarnate? The Mormons believe in the incarnation, but this contradicts it. Their doctrine implies that he had a *body before* he was incarnate, or he had a body before he had a body, or he had a body and had not a body at the same time.

It contradicts the scriptures. "Christ Jesus being in the form of God, took upon him the *form* of a servant, and was *made* in the *likeness of men*; and being found in *fashion* as a man," &c. Phillipp. ii. 5 to 8 v.

It is opposed to the pre-existence of Christ. If a body be necessary to his existence, then he had none, and did not exist until born of the virgin. Luke i. 35. But, "he was in the beginning with God." "The word was made flesh." John i. 2 to 14 v. "He took upon him the form of a servant—he was made in the likeness of men." If a body be necessary to

his existence, then he existed before he existed. He existed before he had a body, but, as nothing can exist without, according to this scheme, and seeing Christ did exist before he had a body, then he existed and did not exist at the same time. But which body are we to believe is really the true body that is to be called the Son of God? Is it the body he possessed when as "the angel of the covenant," he appeared unto Abraham? Or, the body "which was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh?" Or, that body the church, of which it is said "the church which is his body?" Ephes. i. 22, 23. Now which body is really the body of Christ? He cannot have *three* bodies. Let the Mormon inform you if he can!

Saint Paul in 1st Corinthians xv. 44, distinguishes between "a natural body" and "a spiritual body." He says, "There is a natural body, (*soma psuchikon*) and there is a spiritual body" (*soma pneumatikon*). Existences of not only dissimilar but opposite qualities. In 1st Corinthians, 11th chap. Saint Paul discusses the subject of the Lord's Supper, and at the 29th verse, he speaks of those who brought condemation on themselves, because they did not discern the Lord's body. How could they discern it? that body was in a place that is within the veil, even heaven. Now, according to this theory, it could not be in two places at the same time; in heaven and present with them on earth. If we suppose so, then we go into all the absurdities of transubstantiation, and must either suppose our Lord to possess a multiplicity of bodies, which is a contradiction, or conclude that the apostle speaks of another body which true believers discerned when they partook of the Lord's supper. That body is the glorified body of Christ, and not a wafer, but the body in which he once suffered, and now wears on his triumphant throne, discerned by faith. The same line of argument rescues from the sacrilegious hands of the Mormons the scripture, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."* John vi. 53 to 56. Again, Saint Paul says, "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Collos. ii. 9. Mr. Orson Spencer's comment on this text is a curiosity in itself. (Letter 8th.) He says, "the Godhead had a body," and "*his* body is so nearly and

* The Mormons must be Anthropophagi according to their literal translation.

exactly like unto the body of Christ, that there is no difference —the body and person of Jesus Christ and the Father are alike. If one has a *fleshy material* body, the other has the same. If one resembles in stature the seed of the woman, the other also wears the same resemblance." He then speaks of the Father "wearing a body of flesh and bones." It might be enquired if Mr. Spencer, who writes A.B. after his name, did not lose his rationality, when he lost his position as a minister of the gospel. That man an A.B. indeed! to pen such glaring absurdities! Certainly, he has not reached the A.B.C. of reason, the first three letters of logic! Did the *human body* of our Saviour contain the body of the Father and "*the innumerable particles*" of the Holy Spirit? If the theory be as true as the apostle's statement, then it will follow that *three* bodies or material substances *could* occupy the *same place* at the *same time*, which is absurd, or according to our author "impossible." "It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell," Col. i. 19, and why? Because those things which were only typified or adumbrated by the ceremonial law, were actually fulfilled in him "who was made flesh," who was the *substance* not the *shadow*, who was "the very image," the image itself, (*auten ten eikona*), which they pointed out, Heb. x. 1, 14. Or, all the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily, substantially, visibly. The Godhead dwelt in the body of Christ as the soul in the human body. "God was manifested in the flesh." 1 Tim. iii. 16. Thus also Christ was according to the Athanasian Creed. "God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds, and man of the substance of his mother born into the world, who although he be God and man yet he is not two, but one Christ."

If the *spirit* be a material substance it cannot occupy the same space with other matter. How then can the Mormon explain the case of Mary Magdaline? She possessed seven spirits. These were seven material substances in the same place? Our Lord cast out a *legion* of evil spirits in one case. Were they all material substances? If so, they "*condensed*" themselves, as Spencer uses the term, into a very small space. No doubt the reader questions the possibility of any sane person, first embracing and then calmly propogating such errors. Surely their mental vision must be obscured and their eyes blinded.

The Holy Spirit is said "to extend through all space," and in this respect to differ from the person of the Father and the

Son. Certainly, according to the Mormon material scheme, they have no authority for this in scripture. It is said "The Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove" upon the Saviour, and like "as cloven tongues of fire" on the apostles. How can a dove "extend through all space and intermingle with all other matter?" It is a clear impossibility, and consequently their scheme is inconsistent.

These considerations might be greatly extended, but it is unnecessary to advance any more scriptures to show that the material doctrines of the Mormons, respecting the person of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are unscriptural, and the only authority they possess is the heated imagination of these misguided "*Saints.*"

This Mormo-Materialism is Anti-scriptural.

1. The scripture declaration, on the subject now reviewed, is neither equivocal nor meagre. It is written like a sunbeam throughout the whole Bible. It is the express testimony of the scriptures that "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." John iv. 24. That this is to be understood, as not meaning a possession of mortal attributes or a substance of flesh and bones is evident from the testimony of the same infallible witness, one sufficiently well acquainted with all existence, as it really exists. One, not likely either to fall into error or knowing it to be an error to expound it to men, as a substance differing from material existence, if it did not so differ. He says, "a spirit hath not flesh and bones." Luke xxiv. 39.

It is, because "God is a spirit," that "He maketh his angels ministering spirits." Heb. i. 14. It is, because He is a spirit, that He is the "God of the spirits of all flesh." Numb. xxvii. 16. It is, because He is a spirit that He differs from the Egyptians and their gods. "Now the Egyptians are men and not God, and their horses flesh and not spirit." Isaiah xxxi. 3. It is because He is a spirit, that the heathen are condemned who "change the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man." Rom. i. 23. And it is, because "God is a spirit," that the same condemnation will fall on all those who hold similar opinions; and bring down *Him* of whom it is said, "Touching the Almighty we cannot find him out," Job xxxvii. 23; to the standard of mere men and speak in the ignorance of their minds of his "*size*" and "*form*:" and that, "when he has been seen among men, he has been pronounced, even by the wicked, as one of our own

species." * In opposition to the express testimony of the inspired apostle; that He is "the *King eternal, immortal, invisible*," I Tim. i. 17. "The blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in light which no man can approach unto (*Phos oikon aprositon*) whom no *man hath seen* or *can see*," I Tim. vi. 15, 16. And, speaking of God, as a substance of matter, to be seen by man and as actually being seen by man, when the scriptures aver, that "no man hath seen God at any time," John i. 18.

2. The Psalmist was no materialist, when he said, "Into thine had I commit my spirit," Psalm xxxi. 5. St. Paul was no materialist, when he said, "We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," &c., 2 Cor. v. 1—8. The proto-martyr Stephen was no materialist, when he prayed, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit," Acts vii. 60. If Stephen had been a materialist, he would not have commended his spirit to Christ; if he believed that the spirit and body were one, or the spirit were material, he would have acted differently. Stephen could have fallen into no error on this subject; he was inspired. Unless God were *Omnipotent* he could not receive the spirit,—unless God were *Omnipresent* how could he receive the spirit on the spot, or distinguish Stephen's spirit from any other, which might then have escaped from another body?

3. These pretenders speak very largely of their authority and power in bestowing, not only the gifts of the Holy Spirit, but the Holy Spirit *himself*. It is said "*himself*," in opposition to the term "*it*;" for which there is the authority of John xv. 26, "When the Comforter is come—the Spirit of Truth—*he* (*ekeinos*) shall testify of me." These teachers claim to themselves the power of "*administering* the *Spirit*," grounding their pretensions on Paul and Timothy being "able ministers of the Spirit." If the Spirit be a *material* substance, it should have been able *administers* of the Spirit. Query? If the Spirit be a gaseous fluid, then these Mormons are so many electrical machines; and must be conscious of the passage of the fluid. Such are the *revolting absurdities* of this scheme, that it is with difficulty a pious mind, having any proper conception of God, can stoop to pursue them through their *murky* and *malarious* labyrinth.* It is dangerous to come into any thing like proximity to them. If, like the *Squash*, they emitted

* "The Kingdom of God," Part I., p. 4.

their pestiferous odours on your approach, there would be little danger, but being *infidels* and *materialists* at heart, they have yet the impiety and daring hardihood to assume the name of "Saints." It is hoped the reader has already seen sufficient of their character and capacity, to avoid contact with such *inflated* materialists.

4. The next consideration is their denial of the infinity, perfection, and omnipresence of the Godhead. The reader is referred to page 23 for the quotation from the tract.

In opposition to this statement it is only necessary to adduce the express declarations of the Most High. "The eyes of the Lord are in every place beholding the evil and the good," Prov. xv. 3. "Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight, but all things are naked and open unto the eyes of him, with whom we have to do," Heb. iv. 13. "Thou compassest my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways—Whither shall I go from thy spirit; or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me," Psalm cxxxix. 1—12. "Am I a God at hand, saith the Lord, and not a God afar off? Can any hide himself in secret places, that I shall not see him? Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord? The heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee. Great is the Lord, his understanding is infinite." Jer. xxiii. 23, 24.

If God be not every where present, he cannot be the most perfect being. If God be not every where present, he cannot be infinite. If limits circumscribe his presence, then we can conceive that additions may be made to his person, and he is then mutable. It may be here remarked, that *one error* with respect to the perfections of the Deity, effects not merely any individual attribute, but extends itself to *all* the perfections of the Godhead. "Thus saith the Lord, Behold heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool," Isaiah lxvi. 1. "In him we live and move and have our being," Acts xvii. 28. "He filleth all things," Ephes. iv. 10.

"The essential presence is without any division of himself. I fill heaven and earth, not part in heaven and part in earth (as the Mormons make the Holy Spirit to exist), I fill one as well as the other. One part of his essence is not in one place and another part of his essence in another place; he would then be changeable, for that part of his essence which was now in this

place he might alter to another, and place that part of his essence which were in another place to this; but he is undivided every where. It is impossible that one part of his essence can be separated from another; for he is not a body, to have one part separable from another. The light of the sun cannot be cut into parts, it cannot be shut into any place and kept there, it is entire in every place; shall not God, who gives the light that power, be much more present himself? Whatsoever hath parts, is finite, but God is infinite; therefore hath no parts of his essence. Besides if there were such a division of his being, he would not be the most simple and uncompounded Being, but would be made up of various parts; he would not be a spirit, fo rparts are evidences of composition, and it could not be said, that God is here or there; but only a part of God is here and a part of God is there. But he fills heaven and earth; he is as much a God in the earth beneath as in heaven above. 'The Lord he is God in heaven above and upon the earth beneath, there is none else,' Deut. iv. 39. Entirely in all places, not by scraps and fragments of his essence."* "Thou art every where present! O Almighty God! Yes, thou art here, thou art afar off, thou fillest the universe. Here grows a flower, there shines a sun; thou art there, thou art here. Thou art in the breeze and in the tempest, in the light and in the darkness, in an atom and in a world. Thou art here in this flowery valley, thou lendest thine ear to my feeble accents, and thou hearest from the foot of thy throne the sublime songs which accompany the harps of the seraphim."†

How applicable are the words of the prophet to such a god as that depicted by this apostle of the Mormons! Baal was a god possessing perfections like those of the god of the Mormons. He was a god, having a "body, parts and passions," and one who could "eat, drink and talk," that is, he is supposed to possess those attributes. Like the Mormon god, he had departed to another place; for the prophets of Baal cried aloud to him and he could not hear them. Elijah said, "Cry aloud, for he is a god, either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth and must be awakened. And they cried aloud." 1 Kings, xviii, 27. They were in earnest, but they received no answer. "The imaginary modern God"‡ was not so popular then as now. He had only one prophet, but that one prophet received an answer by fire, from

* Charnock on the "Omnipresence of God."
† Sturm's Reflections. ‡ Orson Pratt.

that God, whom "the heaven of heavens cannot contain." 1 Kings, viii, 27.

"My prostrate soul adores the *present* God:
Praise I a *distant* Deity?" (YOUNG, Night 4th).

5. Mr. Orson Pratt says, "there is no such thing as moral image," &c. (See the entire quotation at pages 22, 23). This denies in some respect the moral perfections of the Godhead. The writer will be brief with this part of his task; merely producing a few scriptures to the contrary.

"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." Gen. i, 26, 27. That this was not a *bodily* likeness is evident, from the command given; "Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Gen. ii, 17. Adam did eat of the tree, but he did not die *naturally*, the *same* day; what then is the evident consequence? But that he died *morally*, or lost the *moral* image of God? This conclusion is strengthened by the words of the apostle Paul, a much greater authority than the *apostle* Pratt! Saint Paul in writing to the Colossians says, "Ye have put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him." Col. iii, 10. And again, to the Ephesians. "Ye have put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness" Ephes. iv, 24. To the Corinthians he says. "As we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." 1 Cor. xv, 49. The whole context of the latter scripture from the 44th to the 50th verse, is an evident proof, that there is such a thing as a moral image.

Mr. Pratt says, "Morality is a property of some being or substance. A property without a being or substance to which it appertains, is inconceivable. A property can never have figure, shape or image of any kind." This is very consistent with his materialism, which makes joy, grief, pain and pleasure to be material substances; but not consistent with the fact, as stated by Saint Paul. "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts; to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ." 2 Corin. iv, 6. Here is "the glory of God," or a property essentially belonging to God; the *knowledge* of that glory and "the *light* of the knowledge of the glory;" and all this, "in the face of Jesus Christ." Another scripture will be sufficient on this point. "We all with open face, beholding

as in a glass the *glory* of the Lord, are changed into the *same image*; from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." 2 Cor. iii, 18. "A moral image never had an existence except in the brains of modern idolators," says the author of the tract. Saint Paul then, was an idolator. It has existed in the brains of modern idolators? As a small piece of matter? Well, no *matter* where it existed, as it did exist. But what exists in the brain of Mr. Orson Pratt? It would be well for that gentleman, occasionally to be reminded of the well-known lines of Burns—

> "O wad some power the giftie gie us,
> To see oursels as others see us;
> It wad frae monie a blunder free us
> And foolish notion."

The last quotation (see page 23,) is now to be considered. That shows the author's doctrines tend to *Tritheism*: or that he denies the *personality* of each person in the Trinity, making each to be only a *part* in the Godhead.

The doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, is one of the utmost importance. It is the basis of religion. That theory then, which denies or obscures this doctrine is unworthy of reception. But here is a man, *pretending* to Divine inspiration, who informs us that, "the Father differs in some respects from general matter and the elementary materials of his body are not susceptible of occupying at the same time the same identical space with other matter." What does the author mean by "the *elementary* materials of his body?" Is his body a compounded substance, capable of being reduced to original and simple elements? He says the same "*reasonings*; Was ever a word more perverted? "Reasonings," indeed! such as would not do honour to the head of a schoolboy! After all, they are "*reasonings*," not *divine revelations* These "*reasonings*," or statements, "are equally applicable to the person of the Son." So they are *two distinct* substances. They being matter cannot occupy the same identical space at the same time. "The Holy Spirit is also a material substance of the same nature and properties, in *many* respects, as the spirits of the Father and the Son." Here is a third material substance, and if each of these material substances be God, it follows there are *three* Gods not *one*, God, and the Godhead of the Father of the Son and of the Holy Ghost is not as the creed of Athanasius says "*all one*." Our author falls into a very ancient error in this statement. It is that of the Manichees, who believed Christ

to be of *similar* substance, but not of the *same* substance *(omoousios)* with the Father.* But the author says, "the Holy Spirit being *one part* of the Godhead;" observe "*one part*," then the Father and the Son are the other parts, and these *three parts* make *one* God. Neither is perfect God, but only a *part* of a God. The Father and the Son are not omnipresent, but "the innumerable atoms" of the Holy Spirit are omnipresent. The Holy Spirit then must be the chief or greatest part, and should have the priority. One thing is known, that if there be any superiority or inferiority, in the the Godhead, it cannot be the Holy Spirit which is superior. For Saint Paul says, the Son is the "*Great God.*" "Looking for the glorious appearing of the *Great* God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Titus ii. 13.

Orson Pratt says, "Each atom of the Holy Spirit is intelligent and like all other matter has solidity, form and size, and occupies space."

"*Each atom intelligent?*" Then each possesses an *individuality* or *personality*, and therefore has a *separate indentity* and *consciousness*. It follows that *each atom is* god, and consequently there must be as many gods as there are atoms. We shall then have an infinite variety of gods, or, according to this wonderful discoverer, "*vast immeasurable quantities*" of gods, "in connexion with all material worlds." Yet he says, "If several of the atoms of the Spirit should unite themselves together into the form of a person, then this person of the Holy Spirit would be subject to the same necessity, as the other two persons of the Godhead, that is, it could not be everywhere present." Mr. Pratt seems to have but little respect for *his god*, when he talks of an *omnipresent existence* losing that perfection, and that because "*several*—he does not say *how many!* It may be *ten* or *ten thousand*, of these atoms becoming rebellious and uniting into "the form of a person." But, is not each in a form now? having "solidity, form and size?" These rebellious atoms, however, limit themselves to a place, become the person of the Holy Spirit, and "the *vast quantities*" of atoms which are cut off, are left;—where? *Reason* cannot inform you! Pratt, Spencer and Company is the repository of that secret.

7. The inconsistencies and contradictions of the author's theory might be shown from their own books; viz. the book of Mormon, and the "Book of Doctrine and Covenants," which

* See Pearson "On the Creed," Art 2.

are peculiarly their own property; but it will suffice merely to show how applicable the argument of Mr. Giles, of Leeds, against the Socialists is against Mormonism. He says, "From their profane railing against the personality of the ever blessed God, no less than the general strain of their writings, it is easy to see that the advocates of the "Rational System" are *materialists* in the most extensive sense of the term. Yet ashamed of their atheism, or terrified at their own shadow, they shrink from the sight of it in words and, instead of boldly avowing their belief that the God who made them is matter, skulk into ambiguities, affirming only that he may be such for any thing known to the contrary." Observe, the *Socialist* is *too timid* to avow that God is material, but the Mormon, the "Latter Day *Saint*," is not so *cowardly*. The Mormon *Saint* scruples not to tell you, that he is *certain* by *revelation*, that God is material. There is no ambiguity with him! The *Socialist* is somewhat *modest* in his statements; but he speaks *authoritatively!* Mr. Giles continues, "Vain the hope of shelter in such an asylum. The immateriality of the Deity, like every other simple proposition, is either true or false; and since the Socialist will not *venture* to assert the latter, we shall undertake, from his own acknowledgements to prove the former, and thus show that his handing over the question to *uncertainty* must have arisen either from *incapacity* to see, or unwillingness to avow, the result of his own admission." *

Poor, timid, cautious Socialist! You were too much alarmed at your spectral illusions! You should have sought the apostle of the Latter Day *Saints*, Orson Pratt, and by his miraculous gifts, he would have inspired you with sufficient *courage* to declare your real belief in God's material existence! But there, it could not be! Your "rational system" was the result of mere induction, but here is one of *revelation!* Your Robert Owen possessed not the claims of Joseph Smith! He laboured with his mind, Joseph Smith had it made *ready* to *hand!* Robert Owen could not produce by *reason* what Orson Pratt knows by revelation. Ah! poor, poor, Socialist! You could only arrive at *doubt*; but the Mormon arrives at *certainty!* He is your superior! At his shrine you must burn your incense!

III. The Discoveries of this author are of NO UTILITY to MAN and are DEROGATORY to GOD.

1. After all the pretensions of the Mormons and the dis-

* Vide "Lectures against Socialism," by J. E Giles.

coveries they have made of the Divine Nature, their *utility* to *man* may be *questioned.* It is always well to unite, the useful with the agreeable; or as the ancients called it, "*utile dulci;*" but it is a query, if there be any thing, either useful or pleasant, in their system. Certainly their doctrine will not tend to elevate man, either to a higher degree of intellectual or moral beauty. It will stultify the intellect and debase the moral powers. That individual who believes in the materiality of God, values little either the praise or blame of his compeers, and who void of all shame, excuses himself of all his inconsistencies, on the ground of necessity. That individual who brings the divine and incomprehensible Jehovah down to the standard of human nature, has no fixed rules of morals, and no desire to possess them. He has no restraint and wishes to have none on his actions. The experience of the world and the testimony of all history establish this principle, that, *as are the gods, so are the people.* It is not said, that hideous effects *have* followed the doctrines of the Mormons. It is not said, that any demoralizing effects have positively and actually transpired. But this is said, that the doctrines which are here examined lead legitimately to this conclusion, that such doctrines cannot produce lovely effects, any more than an evil tree can bring forth good fruit. The doctrine withdraws all salutary restraint of the divine presence, and leaves its mistaken votary to hope, that as God is not omnipresent, he may not be omniscient, and that he may escape more easily from condemnation. Cicero objects to an ethical system, that it savoured of nothing grand or generous, (*nihil magnificum, nihil generosum sapit*), so Dugald Stewart says, when he studied the material systems of Hartley, Priestley and Darwin; "I feel as if I were examining the sorry mechanism that gives motion to a puppet." When man discovers that God is only a material being, he rapidly accumulates the presumption, to compass him with infirmities like himself. *True* religion *elevates* man, *false religions humble God.* The hallowing effects of the Christian verity, is to elevate above the corruptions which are in the world, through lust; and to make its subject "a partaker of the Divine Nature." But that, which is of the earth is earthy.

2. This *system* is *derogatory* to God, because it brings him down to the level with man. "It is extremely difficult to form any idea of God, at all worthy of his majesty, and greatness."* But not so, if this theory be true, few things are

* Sturm's Reflections.

more easy. "To whom will ye liken me saith the Lord?" The Mormon *saint* answers, "to a being like myself, and possessing the same properties as myself, and about the same *size*." And is this all he can teach us? Then the pious man prefers his error, for he will be more happy in it. After all the pretensions of the church for such a lengthened period—after all the controversies,

"This ocean into tempest tost."

Is it only,

"To waft a feather, and to drown a fly?"

Is "the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the blessed and only Potentate, who only hath immortality, and dwelling in unapproachable light," such a *pigmy* as a Mormon; then let man continue in his rambling ideality! Let him picture to himself one, whom the most exalted effort of his mind cannot grasp; if it do him no more good than inspire him with awe and wonder, and trembling adoration, and with angels he hides his face in his hands, in contemplating the glories of God's moral and intellectual nature, and trying all his strength in searching for untraversed lines of splendour; if this be all, let him remain in error! He will be happy! If it be only imagination, let him alone, he will be happy! But, if after contemplating these things, he finds all is tinsel, all is varnish, then he will be miserable; for this system, their god, cannot satisfy the longings of his soul, or the anxious bursting throbings of his desires—their god is too little, too small, too insignificant! He wants a *real* God, whom he can adore! At whose feet he can fall with rapturous emotions of veneration; and "in whose presence there is fulness of joy, and at whose right hand there are pleasures for evermore." Psalm xvi. 11.

The Mormon god not being an omnipresent and perfect spiritual existence, is *no god*.

"God is light,
And never but in unapproached light
Dwelt from eternity;" (MILTON).

But their god is *like* unto themselves and "*where* he is, *they cannot tell*." This scheme then, is opposed to true philosophy and scriptural theology. These are so many calm and deliberate reasons for rejecting this novel system; which while it is so meagre and humiliating, derogatory to God and prejudicial to man; its propagators have the effrontery

"To hold up their taper light
And cry behold the sun!"

That these bold pretenders may be successfully met, each individual in society has a responsibility to discharge. Men un-

accustomed to reason, and untutored by education and a knowledge of the Bible are the miserable victims of this nefarious falsehood! It shows the necessity of more extensive intellectual and moral culture! Each should be shown the usefulness and happiness of education! Tell them to improve their minds! To search the scriptures! Uproot all poisonous and noxious weeds and do not let your minds become, neither sterile deserts nor luxuriant with useless flowers, which may indeed captivate the vision, but exhale no fragrance and are adapted to no intellectual and moral end. The mind may be decorated in gorgeous apparel, which dazzles for the moment, but which may soon discover its superficial character. It will be no *proof* of *incapacity* to receive error. But let your minds be sanctified with scripture truth, and they will shine with a lustre surpassing far, the boasted advantages of modern revelators. Tell them! that with a sanctified and cultivated intellect, man is competent to survey nature and contemplate the Deity. That he discovers the various laws which cause the variety and change in the creation. He acquaints himself with the formation of the birds of the air, the beasts of the field, and the fish of the sea. He looks into the constitution of the infinite variety of insects and reptiles, which people the earth. He admires the varied plants and shrubs, and from these, as well as from the minerals secreted beneath the earth's surface, he extracts medicine, to relieve him pain, and to increase his happiness. He scans the blue vault of heaven, counts the stars, traces their paths and computes their distances. He sees in all this a design, a wisdom, a goodness and a power; which lead him to adore that all-perfect Being who framed them all. He is led, to contemplate the almighty wisdom and goodness, which gave beauty to the gem, gracefulness to the shrub, fragrance to the flower, and a glory to them all. Through nature, he looks up to nature's God; and seeing such vastness in the grand and harmonised machine, he concludes that the Author, the Original Architect must be Infinite, Omnipresent and Eternal; and he adores that God who

> "Not content
> With every food of life to nourish man,
> By kind illusions of the wondering sense,
> Thou mak'st all nature, *beauty* to his eye,
> Or *music* to his ear." (AKENSIDE).

He also looks into the workings of Divine Providence. He is astonished at its machinery, and lost in wonder and amazement at the controul, which He who sits at the head of affairs possesses over such minute, varied, and apparently opposite parts, of that vast machine. He admires the harmony of the whole,

and especially how "all things work together for good, to them that love God." Rom. viii, 28. He concludes reasonably and justly, that "God is good."

> "His bestowing love
> Knew no beginning; was not as a change
> Of mood that woke at last, and started up
> After a deep and solitary sloth
> Of boundless ages: no, he now is good;
> He ever was." (AKENSIDE).

and then he desires to possess the same benignant character.

Show them! that the educated man is an ornament to society, and spreads a halo around the social circle; that he adds a lustre, an undecaying beauty, to

> "The prattling ring, the social cheer,
> Affection's voice, affection's tear;" (KIRKE WHITE),

that he guards the avenues, and allows no whisper derogatory to God or demoralising to man, to enter within its precincts, or to invade

> "The mild majesty of private life,
> Where Peace with ever-blooming olive crowns
> The gate, where Honour's lib'ral hand effuse
> Unenvy'd treasures, and the snowy wings
> Of Innocence and Love protect the scene." *(Akenside.)*

Such is the character of the intelligent and pious man. He is the palladium of society, and enjoys the confidence of his fellow men. The character and position of the infidel is widely different. The soil of the infidel is barren of happiness, and he has no rest for the sole of his foot. The christian, however, is not satisfied with merely intellectual attainments or mental culture. He rests not until his gaze is fixed on Calvary, and there he sees more of God and his awful majesty, than in Creation and Providence united. He sees Divine majesty, mingling with Divine mercy, interwoven with Divine love. He views the attributes of God in glorious harmony. He exults in such an exhibition of Divine goodness, and falling prostrate before the cross is "lost in wonder, love, and praise." He exclaims, "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honour come of thee, and thou reignest over all; and in thine hand is power and might; and in thine hand it is to make great, and to give strength unto all." 1 Chronicles xxix. 11, 12. "Blessed be the Lord God, the God of Israel, who only doeth wondrous things. And blessed be his glorious name for ever: and let the whole earth be filled with his glory; Amen, and Amen." Psalm lxxii. 18, 19.

E. JONES, Printer, "Journal Office," Thomas Street, Woolwich.